DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 332 24 HE 000 102

By- Milton, Ohmer

Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making. Final Report.

Tennessee Univ., Knoxville.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No- BR-7-D-037
Pub Date May 68
Grant- OEG-1-7-070037-4347
Note- 35p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85
Descriptors- Administrative Policy, *Attitudes, *Decision Making, Discipline Policy, *Faculty, Faculty Evaluation, *Higher Education, Student Opinion, *Student Participation, Teacher Attitudes

Many students seek and many administrators have called for greater student involvement in important academic decision making. And because faculty members, who control most academic policies and procedures, have remained strangely silent about such matters, it was decided to investigate, in a more detailed and systematic fashion than had been done previously, their attitudes toward student participation in determining cogent campus policies. At the same time, an effort was made to obtain data that might indirectly reflect the conventionality of faculty thinking about approaches to teaching and learning. A randomly selected sample of 200 faculty members was interviewed at 4 colleges and 2 universities. "Yes", "No", or "Don't know" answers to questions regarding specific areas of student participation (e.g., curriculum planning) could be qualified. There was general agreement that students should participate extensively in matters of student discipline, but not in the affairs of a legal governing board. They should be encouraged to complete evaluative types of questionnaires on teachers, but the results should be seen only by the teacher concerned. In other areas, a "Yes" vote meant only that student ideas should be heard, but the means for obtaining their views is left unclear. This study has been highly limited in its sampling of institutions, and more land-grant colleges and universities should be sampled via mailed questionnaires. (JS)

EDO 24332

BR 7-D-037
PA-24

BA 24

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-D-037
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070037-4347

SURVEY OF FACULTY VIEWS ON STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

May 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE000 102

Final Report

Project No. 7-D-037
Grant No. OEG-1-7-070037-4347

Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making

Ohmer Milton

The University of Tennessee

Knoxville, Tennessee

May 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	SUMMARY	1
II.	INTRODUCTION	3
	Prior Research	4
	Purposes	6
III.	METHODS	7
	Current Participation	8
	Faculties	10
	Qualitative Data on Question No. 1	11
	Administrators	14
	Faculties and Administrators	15
IV.	SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS	17
	Conclusions	17
	Recommendations	18
REFERENCES		20
APPENDIX		21

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Percentages of "Yes," "No," and "Don't Know" Responses at Nearby Colleges -- Question No. 1	
	Partial Table ("Yes" Answers Only)	10
	Complete Table (Appendix B)	25
II.	Percentages of "Yes," "No," and "Don't Know" Responses The University of Tennessee -- Question No. 1	
	Partial Table ("Yes" Answers Only)	12
	Complete Table (Appendix C)	27
III.	Percentage Giving "None"	13
IV.	Percentage of "Yes," "No," and "Don't Know" Responses by Administrators -- Question No. 1	
	Partial Table ("Yes" Answers Only)	15
	Complete Table (Appendix E)	31
V.	Percentage of "Yes" Responses for Faculties and Administrators	16
VI.	Faculty Attitude Toward Students -- Questions 2 and 3	29
VII.	Administrative Attitude Toward Students -- Questions 2 and 3	29

I. Summary

Within the past few years several administrative leaders in higher education have proposed that students be allowed to participate in important decision making on their own campuses. Within recent months, particularly, students on many campuses have been clamoring for official and formal arrangements whereby their views can be heard. Generally speaking, faculty members have been strangely silent about such matters and a review of the literature suggests that little is known about faculty views.

Yet faculty members are in direct control of most academic policies and procedures and constitute the group in many cases that determine whether or not students participate or are involved in decision making -- and if so, in what manner or to what degree. Consequently, the major purpose of this investigation was to explore faculty attitudes or opinions about student involvement in determining cogent campus policies in a more detailed and systematic fashion than has been done previously. At the same time, the effort was made to obtain data which might reflect indirectly the conventionality of faculty thinking about approaches to teaching-learning.

A randomly selected sample of full-time faculty members was interviewed at each of the following schools: Carson-Newman College, Knoxville College, Maryville College, George Peabody College for Teachers, Tennessee Technological University, and The University of Tennessee (Knoxville campus). The Interview Schedule was designed so as to provide two kinds of data: quantitative and qualitative. Each respondent could thus respond "Yes," "No," or "Don't Know" about specific areas in which students might participate in decision making: student discipline, evaluation of teachers, academic calendar arrangements, curriculum planning, degree requirements, grading systems, faculty governing board, legal governing board. Each respondent could also qualify his remarks in any direction or manner desired.

There is agreement among faculty in these several schools that students should participate rather fully in matters of student discipline, that they should not participate in the affairs of a legal governing board, and that they should participate in the evaluation of teachers. This latter means that students should complete evaluative types of questionnaires and that results should be seen only by the teacher concerned.

A "Yes" vote in the other areas inquired about means only that student ideas and suggestions should be received; thinking is not clear or crystallized about the means by which student views should be obtained. Only two of the 200 interviewed voluntarily made any

mention of the fact that participation by students in important and relevant decision making on the campus might promote their maturity and aid the cause of learning.

The present study has been highly limited in its sampling of institutions of higher education. Land grant colleges and universities should be sampled on a larger basis. The obtaining of large samples within each one would enable the manipulation of more variables (for example, faculties in different subject matter fields) than in the present institutions and might also reflect regional variations. A mailed questionnaire should be used. Multiple choice alternatives could be provided for specific determination of the types of students who would represent their classmates and the manner of their selection.

II. Introduction

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present . . . . *

Some observers of recent campus events have suggested that student revolt on the one hand and student apathy on the other are both reactions, in part, to the autocracy of the educational establishment. Joseph Shoben, for one, has interpreted the assertions of talented students -- representing 33 colleges and universities who attended the National Conference on Student Stress in the College Experience late in 1965 -- to mean:

> For many thoughtful students, our halls of learning are littered with regulations enforced by bureaucrats, and the bureaucrats can only be conceived as adversaries . . . the undergraduate still yearns to play a more determinative role and to enjoy more flexibility in planning his areas of concentration and distribution.[1]

The opinion has been advanced also that the 1964 disturbance at Berkeley, the most celebrated instance of student discontent, resulted to some degree from the students' desire to have more control over their own academic lives than has been true traditionally. Indeed, the Select Committee on Education, created by the Berkeley Academic Senate of the University of California in the spring of 1965, following a year of study and deliberation, concluded:

> Our ideal for the student is that he be provided with rich opportunities, generous guidance, and plenty of room for experiment, and that he be enabled to make for himself as many of the important decisions about his own education as possible.[2]

Numerous publications have reported that students are seeking -- and in some instances demanding -- to participate actively in determining the academic policies in the institutions they attend. Perhaps student creation of the "free universities" and "experimental colleges" at several schools best illustrates the depth of their dissatisfaction with the status quo and at the same time, reflects what at least some of them mean by "academic affairs."

Within the past few years, several administrative leaders in higher education have proposed that students be allowed to participate in important decision making on their own campuses. For example,

---

*Quotation continued on page 19.

E. K. Fretwell, formerly Dean of Academic Development at the City University of New York, has implored:

> We should identify competent student leadership and give it a greater role in helping run the college or university.[3]

President Edward D. Eddy of Chatham College has echoed a similar plea:

> Student participation, with the fresh point of view it brings, is highly desirable in such areas as curriculum planning, evaluation of teachers and teaching, and academic administration including degree requirements, grading systems and calendars.[4]

President James P. Dixon of Antioch College seems to have captured the raison d'etre of student involvement in important decision-making in this assertion:

> If one believes that teaching is most effective when it is most motivated by the student and that non-autocratic human behavior has a higher happiness and survival value than authoritarian behavior, then one sees in the process of student participation the possibility that our rather crusty educational institutions can be moved in desirable directions.[5]

In this connection, Mager and McCann[6] have advanced the hypothesis that learner motivation in an instructional setting is a direct function of the amount of apparent control the learner can exert over the situation; they offer convincing data from a training program in an industrial plant to substantiate their position.

Generally speaking, however, desires for student involvement and participation in academic policy-making have been expressed by only two of the three core groups in the higher education enterprise -- administrators and students. By and large, faculty members have been silent about these matters and only a very few formal investigations have been conducted.

Prior Research

A survey of 70 institutions in 1951 revealed that students had a major voice in "student affairs"; yet, in most of the schools, students had essentially no voice in "academic affairs."[7]

An inquiry into the desirable extent of student participation in policy determination and administration in 109 teacher-training institutions was conducted in 1959. Since the presidents or their designated representatives completed the questionnaires, faculty opinions

about these matters were only inferences. Twenty-six percent of faculties were thought to support greater participation by students, while fifty-six percent of them presumably preferred no changes. In four of the colleges, faculties were believed to desire that the extent of student participation be decreased.[8]

In 1967 the presidents of local chapters of the American Association of University Professors were interviewed (as representatives of their faculties) at the eleven midwest universities comprising the Council for Institutional Cooperation -- Universities of Chicago, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; Indiana, Michigan State, Northwestern, Ohio State, and Purdue Universities.[9] The investigation was an attempt to clarify the role of students in the formation of university policies -- both "academic" and "social." "Academic policies" included: quality of instruction, size of classes, grading systems, promotion and tenure of faculty, examination procedures, class attendance regulations, curriculum development, admission standards, and graduation requirements. "Social policies" referred to: standards of personal conduct, women's hours, student dress standards, disciplinary procedures, and off-campus living privileges.

The respondents were cautious in discussing student participation in academic policy-making; the majority of them believed that the present degree of involvement was sufficient -- this meant that student opinions should be sought in a continuing informal manner, for example, by having them serve on advisory committees. These faculty members did not believe that students should be appointed to faculty committees.

In rather marked contrast, these same respondents felt that there should be more student participation in deciding "social" policy issues than is now the case. Furthermore, it was thought that there should be less regulatory power by the university over students' personal and social behavior.

In the final analysis, of course, faculty members are in direct control of most academic policies and procedures and constitute the group which in many cases will determine whether or not students participate or are involved in decision making -- and, if so, in what manner and to what degree. If, then, students are to be included eventually as one group of academic decision makers, a first step toward such realization is a better understanding of faculty views toward such matters than now prevails.

Perhaps an issue closely related to student participation in important policy making is the extent to which faculty members are conventional in their thinking about teaching-learning arrangements in general. A recent investigation suggests that teaching-learning is viewed rather narrowly by these principal directors. Evans[10] found that the faculty of one institution thought of themselves as "good" teachers, saw lecturing as teaching, and focused almost entirely upon content.

Purposes

Consequently, the major purpose of this investigation was to explore faculty attitudes or opinions about student involvement in determining cogent campus policies in a more detailed and systematic fashion than has been done previously. At the same time, the effort was made to obtain data which might reflect, at least indirectly, the conventionality of faculty thinking about approaches to teaching-learning. Finally, the results of this investigation should suggest directions for further exploration of these viable themes.

III. Methods

"For so it is, O Lord my God, I measure it;
but what it is that I measure I do not know."

St. Augustine

Decisions about the many facets of data gathering and research design must always be tempered by the reality factors of time, money, and existing knowledge of the problem under consideration. There are approximately 2,300 institutions of higher learning in the United States and approximately 350,000 faculty members. Moreover, these institutions and people vary along many dimensions. The former differ in size, programs, finances, types of students, philosophies, and others; the latter differ in fields of interest or specialization, types of training, age, length of service, ranks or positions, "personality," and others. The main problem, too -- decision making -- is a rather nebulous or general one which has not been studied intensively or extensively. For these reasons, all of the possibly relevant variables could not be considered; rather, segments of them were selected for investigation within the confines of imposed reality limitations.

The four-year institutions chosen were located in one geographical area (Tennessee) and in close proximity to each other: The University of Tennessee (Knoxville campus), Carson-Newman College, Knoxville College, Tennessee Technological University, Maryville College, and George Peabody College for Teachers. These schools represent a portion of the four-year spectrum of higher education: a large land grant university; two small sectarian religious colleges -- one Baptist, one Presbyterian; a medium-sized service oriented university; a small predominantly Negro College; and a teacher training institution.

A randomly selected sample of full-time faculty members was interviewed at each of the schools. Size of the samples ranged from 10-50 percent (the smaller the full-time staff, the larger the sample). In all instances, every n^{th} name was chosen from an official list of assistant, associate, and full professors by a designated local representative. The University of Tennessee was the only school where sampling was accomplished on a broad specialization basis (for example, Engineering). The N's were too small to allow meaningful differentiations, that is, samples were not drawn by specific subject matter specialization (for example, English or Mathematics); there was large scale utilization of either part-time people, or graduate students, or those with the rank of Instructor at all of the schools.

The representative also arranged appointments for the interview -- in most instances, all were completed on a given campus within a short span of time (two or three days). When a particular person was not available, the next name on the list was chosen -- this occurred rarely and was due to other pressing commitments or to the individual being absent from the campus.

An interview approach was utilized rather than a mailed questionnaire for several reasons: 1) faculty members have been complaining about the increasing burden of questionnaires and many times do not complete them; as a result, the nature of the sample remains a mystery and 2) it was felt that respondents should have an opportunity to express their views rather freely about such complex issues.

The Interview Schedule was designed so as to provide two kinds of data: quantitative and qualitative (see Appendix A). Each respondent could thus respond "Yes," "No," or "Don't Know" to some of the items and then qualify his remarks in any direction or manner desired. Since "decision making" is such an encompassing term and can cover the creation of minor rules as well as the development of significant and broad long-range policies, specific activities in which students might participate were identified (note in Question No. 1 in the Interview Schedule, Appendix A, that these vary over a range of complexity). The other three questions were included in an effort to determine (qualitatively) how respondents felt about students and the manner in which they perceived the teaching-learning process as well as the extent to which they had thought about it in depth.

The interviewers were advanced graduate students from the fields of psychology and educational psychology -- all of them received detailed orientation about the investigation and conducted at least two dry-run interviews.

Finally, several administrators were also interviewed on each campus (with the exception of George Peabody College for Teachers*) ranging from two at the smallest school to ten at the largest one.

Current Participation

At the beginning of the survey, each local representative was asked to indicate the extent and manner of student participation in decision making on his campus. Such descriptive data can serve, in comparison with comparable data collected at later dates, as some indication of the degree and kind of changes which might occur.

1) The University of Tennessee:

   a) Students have served for several years on Disciplinary Committees of the Administrative Council -- they hold equal voting rights with the staff on these committees.

   b) Students served from the spring of 1966 to the fall of 1967 on an ad hoc Committee on Academic Integrity

---

*This school was not included in the original proposal. Fortuitous circumstances made it possible to interview the faculty.

appointed by The University of Tennessee Senate -- they had equal voting rights with faculty members.

c) Early in the fall of 1967, the President of the Student Government Association was seated with vote on The University of Tennessee Senate.

d) For several years, the Colleges of Agriculture and Business Administration have had student committees serving in advisory capacities.

2) Knoxville College:

a) Students serve with vote on a variety of extra-curricular committees. They are appointed by the President of the Student Union (a student organization).

b) Student representatives serve on a curriculum committee without vote. They are appointed by the President of the Student Union.

3) Maryville College:

a) During a recent wide-scale revision of the entire curriculum, student committees supplied ideas and suggestions to faculty committees -- the latter made the final decisions.

4) Tennessee Technological University:

a) During the school year, 1966-67, under the auspices of the Associated Student Body, students conducted an evaluation of faculty members via a questionnaire and published the results.

b) Students serve on a variety of extra-curricular committees. They are appointed by the Associated Student Body.

5) Carson-Newman College:

a) Students have served in an advisory capacity over the years on extra-curricular committees.

b) Early in the fall, 1967, the Student Government Association raised a number of questions concerning both extra-curricular and academic affairs.

IV. Results and Analysis

"The American mind seems extremely vulnerable to the belief that any alleged knowledge which can be expressed in figures is in fact as final and exact as the figures in which it is expressed." Hofstadter

Faculties

For clarity of presentation and for ease of reading only, the percentages of "yes" responses (there were very few "Don't Know's") are shown in the tables in the body of this report -- detailed statistics are to be found in Appendices B and C. Table I contains the percentage of "Yes" responses to Question No. 1: "Do you think students should have a voice in determining -- all, any, or none -- of the following activities within this school (assume no legal aspects)?"

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF "YES" RESPONSES OF FACULTIES TO QUESTION NO. 1

Activity	Carson Newman College N=21	Knoxville College N=10	Maryville College N=16	George Peabody College N=17	Tenn. Tech. Univ. N=35	Univ. of Tenn. N=80
Student Discipline	90	90	100	94	88	88
Evaluation of Teachers	81	80	93	82	91	83
Academic Calendar	57	60	56	65	60	59
Curriculum Planning	24	80	81	71	49	44
Degree Requirements	24	30	44	47	43	28
Grading Systems	24	50	68	59	57	54
Faculty Governing Board	52	20	44	59	66	53
Legal Governing Board	24	20	25	35	20	20

It is to be noted in Table I that well over three-fourths of the faculty members at all six schools stated that students should have a voice in matters of Student Discipline and in the Evaluation of Teachers. It can be noted, also, that from two-thirds to three-fourths of

these faculty members believe that students should not participate in decisions made by the Legal Governing Boards. For the remainder of the activities or areas, the percentage of "Yes" responses varies considerably from school to school.

Because faculty members had been sampled by broad areas of specialization at The University of Tennessee, the percentages of "Yes" responses (to Question No. 1) by "colleges" within that institution are shown in Table II (see Appendix C for detailed statistics).

It may be seen in Table II that, at one extreme, there is substantial agreement among the faculties of the colleges in that well over three-fourths of those interviewed believe that students should have a voice in Discipline. At the other extreme, a decided majority believes that students should not be involved with affairs of the Board of Trustees. These results are consistent with those from the other five schools.

For the remainder of the activities or areas, it can be observed that there are wide variations in the percentages of faculty members who replied "Yes" both within a college and among the colleges. Faculties in Engineering and in Education are less inclined than their colleagues in other colleges to have students participate in the Evaluation of Teachers.

Qualitative Data on Question No. 1

There were marked similarities from school to school in the kind and degree of participation meant by "Yes" replies and in the reasons given when a substantial percentage voted "No." In the immediate paragraphs which follow, the effort will be made to reflect the predominant trends in thinking and also point out occasional exceptions to the generalizations.

Student participation in the area of Student Discipline means that students should serve with minority voting rights on faculty committees. In the area of Evaluation of Teachers, it means that student opinions should be obtained via evaluative questionnaires administered in classes with the results being seen only by the individual instructor. In all the other areas, student participation means that their ideas and suggestions should be heard only. The mechanisms or procedures by which this might be accomplished are not at all clear, nor is thinking crystallized about the types of students to be heard. Possibilities range from general elections from the entire student body to highly academically qualified seniors selected by the faculty. By inference, such representatives of the students, however chosen, would convey concerns to appropriate faculty committees.

By the same token, the reasons given in opposition were similar from area to area and in substance were to the effect that students

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF "YES" RESPONSES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Question No. 1

Activity	Agriculture N=14	Business Administration N=10	Education N=9	Engineering N=13	Home Economics N=5	Liberal Arts N=29
Student Discipline	100	80	88	85	80	86
Evaluation of Teachers	100	90	55	69	80	86
Academic Calendar	71	70	77	15	100	55
Curriculum Planning	71	30	55	8	60	45
Degree Requirements	64	20	44	0	20	21
Grading Systems	86	50	55	23	40	55
UT Senate	79	10	33	62	40	59
Board of Trustees	50	10	0	0	20	24

are not mature, do not possess sufficient information, and in the case of the Legal Governing Boards are too transient on the academic scene to contribute anything worthwhile.

Exceptions to these generalizations included: 1) The University of Tennessee College of Business Administration which felt that the Evaluation of Teachers results should be shared with Department Heads and Deans, 2) Tennessee Technological University and George Peabody College where there was no agreement about the manner by which students should participate in the Evaluation of Teachers, and 3) faculties in professional programs who asserted that students should not participate in Curriculum Planning and Degree Requirements because "these are matters for the experts" and "students are not familiar with national standards."

A final portion of this first question was: "Are there any other aspects of student participation which you would like to mention?" It was included because significant areas may have been omitted in the main body of the question and because of the possibility of rich qualitative data emerging. Most of the "other aspects" mentioned were very general in nature such as the need for better communication between faculty and students. Table III contains the percentage of respondents by institution and by The University of Tennessee colleges who made no additions.

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE GIVING "NONE"

					University of Tennessee					
CN %	KC %	MC %	GPC %	TTU %	Ag %	BA %	Ed %	Engg %	HE %	LA %
43	10	38	24	46	14	40	56	62	0	21

When one considers the vast number of policy issues that are being discussed continually on a campus by standing committees as well as by ad hoc ones from time to time, it is indeed strange that so few specific possibilities were mentioned. It also seems strange that in five of these groups, slightly less than half to considerably more than half of the respondents did not suggest additional areas in which students might participate in decision making. There are, of course, several ways of interpreting these omissions: perhaps they mean lack of interest or concern and in a related manner they may mean a narrow or conventional conception of teaching-learning by faculty members.

The questions, "What characteristics or qualities of undergraduate students today irritate you?" (Number 2) and "What positive characteristics or qualities do you notice in today's undergraduates?" (Number 3), were included in an effort to determine how faculties felt about students; it was believed that the answers to these questions might help to explain faculty attitudes toward student participation in decision-making.

The data were analyzed in a variety of ways but proved to be so abmiguous as to preclude any meaningful observations. A simple tabulation of each characteristic or quality revealed the respondents to be most irritated by: students' lack of interest in academic pursuits, their irresponsibility or deficiency in self-discipline, and their unkempt appearance (there are almost no students fitting this latter description on any of the six campuses; at The University of Tennessee, for example, there are perhaps two dozen unkempt ones among the 21,000 enrolled). On the other hand, the most frequently mentioned positive qualities included students': seriousness of purpose, openness and tolerance, and being better prepared academically. A crude "scoring system" (see Appendix D) revealed that in only two of the eleven groups, a higher percentage of respondents saw students more negatively than positively -- the differences are slight.

As a final query, each faculty member was asked: "If you alone could introduce one major change on this campus which would result in an improved learning situation for undergraduate students, what would it be?" Disappointingly, the great majority of suggestions were general and vague ones; for example, improve motivation, obtain better faculty, improve physical facilities, and less emphasis upon grades. These general ones were similar from school to school.

The very few specific suggestions were also similar from school to school (with an occasional unique exception) and included: independent study for upper classmen, reduce the number of classes carried at a given time, and providing an option for eliminating final exams.

The one specific suggestion made more frequently than any other was that of the need for "smaller classes" -- the epitome of conventional and traditional thinking.

Administrators

Because of the small size of several of the institutions, there were only a few academic administrators available to be interviewed. There were so many at The University of Tennessee and such a variety that it was difficult to know which ones to choose. In all cases, however, these respondents were academic administrators -- Deans and Associate Deans of Colleges, for example, and members of the central administrative staff. The data from this group can be used for crude comparisons with the faculty data.

Table IV presents the percentages of "Yes" responses to question number one for The University of Tennessee administrators as a group and for those from all the other schools combined (there were very few "Don't Know" responses -- detailed statistics are presented in Appendix E).

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE OF "YES" RESPONSES BY ADMINISTRATORS

	Stud. Disc. %	Eval. of Teachers %	Acad. Cal. %	Curr. Plann. %	Degree Require. %	Grading Systems %	Fac. Bd. %	Legal Board %
U.T.	100	100	80	70	80	80	100	30
Others	100	91	91	73	27	73	45	45

It is to be noted that there are striking similarities between these two groups for all areas except those of Degree Requirements and Faculty Governing Boards. Implementation-wise, the thinking of the administrators is remarkably similar to that of the faculty. For example, they, too, exhibit great confusion about which students should represent their peers and how they should be selected.

Since all but four (two at UT and two from Others) of these 21 administrators replied to the remaining portion of question number one, "Are there other aspects of a student participation which you would like to mention," a table does not seem necessary. Most of the suggestions were for students having more controlling voices in various extracurricular activities. Two respondents advocated campuses being "open-communities" in that students should participate in all decision-making.

Replies to questions number two and three were quite similar to those of the faculty and again a higher percentage of administrators see students positively.

The final query was "If you alone could introduce one major change on this campus which would result in an improved learning situation for undergraduate students, what would it be?" By far the greatest number of suggestions were general in nature such as "more curricular flexibility," "deemphasizing grades," and "better faculty." Few specific suggestions were made.

Faculties and Administrators

Although the separate data for the faculties on question number

one indicate that there are wide variations within that group, a comparison of the responses of the two main groups may be instructive. Consequently, Table V contains the percentages of "Yes" responses for all the faculty members combined and for all the administrators combined.

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE OF "YES" RESPONSES FOR FACULTIES AND ADMINISTRATORS

	Stud. Disc. %	Eval. of Teachers %	Acad. Cal. %	Curr. Plann. %	Degree Require. %	Grading Systems %	Fac. Bd. %	Legal Board %
Fac.	92	85	60	58	36	52	49	24
Adm.	100	95.5	85.5	71	53.5	76	72.5	37.5

It can be seen in Table V that for every area or activity, a greater percentage of administrators than faculty members voted "Yes" for student participation.

IV. Summary Observations

"An Expert is a person who avoids
all the small errors as he sweeps
on to the grand fallacy."
author unknown

Complete and accurate portrayal of the rich data which emerged in the present survey is an impossible undertaking. Almost all of the persons interviewed gave generously and courteously of their time and appeared to be deeply concerned about the issues at hand. Further condensation will surely do violence to the thinking of these people about these complex matters. Nevertheless, a few summary observations or conclusions may be in order.

Conclusions

It seems clear that there is agreement among faculties that students should participate rather fully in determining non-academic policies. In the present instance, non-academic refers to Student Discipline; in the studies reviewed, it is even broader and includes personal and social behavior in general. Moreover, the current faculty thinking is consistent with that exhibited at other schools both now and as early as 1951.

A second unmistakable trend is agreement among the majority of those interviewed that students should participate in the Evaluation of Teachers. For the most part, this means that students should complete evaluative types of questionnaires about individual faculty members and that the results should be seen only by the teacher concerned.

A third area of substantial agreement is that students should not participate in affairs of the Legal Governing Board of a given institution. The predominant reasons given in support of this belief are that students do not possess either appropriate or sufficient knowledge about the issues that are considered and that they are transient in residence.

Generally speaking, a "Yes" vote in the other spheres or areas inquired about means only that student ideas and suggestions should be received. Thinking is not clear or crystallized about the manner by which student views should be obtained. These findings, too, seem consistent with the recent one conducted with the Presidents of local chapters of the American Association of University Professors.

Viewing the data as a whole, it appears that faculty members as a group today tend to be traditional and conventional in their thinking about teaching-learning issues in general. This is to say, when given the opportunity, few faculty members go beyond such usual cliches as the need to improve student motivation, the need for more

and better faculty members, and the necessity for small classes.

Finally, there was one significant and incongruous omission by these staff members of institutions of higher learning. Only two -- one faculty member and one administrator -- of the 200 interviewed voluntarily made any mention of the fact that participation by students in important and relevant decision-making on the campus might promote their maturity and aid the cause of learning.

Recommendations

The present study has been highly limited in its sampling of institutions of higher education and of faculty members. Of course, additional samples can be of many sorts. In view of the facts, however, that the greatest number of students today are in publicly supported institutions and will probably be in the future, perhaps focus should be on them. A beginning would be with the large land-grant establishments on a regional basis -- one in each area -- the Southwest, West, Mid-West, and North Atlantic. Larger samples than the one at The University of Tennessee within each one of them would enable the manipulation of more variables than in the present instance and might also reflect regional variations.

Since The University of Tennessee data might provide some basis for guidance in construction, a mailed questionnaire might be in order. Multiple choice alternatives could be provided for specific determination of the types of students who would represent their classmates and the manner of their selection. At the same time, additional activities or areas in which students might participate in decision making, for example, those at the departmental level, should be included. Moreover, a large mailed questionnaire sample would enable tapping the variable of faculty members who have been on a campus where there have been student uprisings versus those who have not.

More penetrating, revealing, and meaningful data about faculty attitudes toward students *per se* than were obtained herein might be secured by a Semantic Differential Scale.

Perhaps a most enlightening endeavor would be that of determining the actual extent of student participation in decision making on a sample of campuses via a mailed questionnaire -- the six campuses in this study suggest that it is minimal. Such data could provide a base-line for investigating change over a period of years.

Within a different recommendation context, the results of this limited investigation seem to have certain implications for some of the higher education crises at hand. Faculty members need to be far

better educated than they apparently are about the changing times in which they operate.

> . . . Since our case is new, we must think anew, act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."*
>
> Lincoln

---

*End of quotation started on page 3.

References

1. Shoben, Edward Joseph, Jr. Students, Stress, and the College Experience. Washington, D. C.: U. S. National Student Association, November, 1965, p. 21.

2. Muscatine, Charles (chairman), Select Committee on Education. Education at Berkeley. Berkeley: University of California, March, 1966, p. 218.

3. Fretwell, E. K., Jr. "Pressures and Priorities in Education -- Re-Examined." Paper read to the Summer Conference of the Association for Higher Education, New York City, June 28, 1965.

4. Eddy, Edward D., Jr. "Some Suggestions for Student Involvement in Educational Policy," The College and the Student, Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kaufman, editors. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966, p. 170.

5. Dixon, James P. "Student Impact on Colleges," Antioch Notes, Vol. 45, No. 7 (April, 1968), 7.

6. Mager, Robert F. and John McCann. "Learner-Controlled Instruction." Palo Alto: Varian Associates, 1966. (Multilithed.)

7. Lunn, Harry H., Jr. The Students' Role in College Policy-Making. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957, p. 17.

8. Carr, Alden J. Student Participation in College Policy-Making. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1959, p. 50.

9. Aceto, Thomas D. "How Students, Faculty, and Administrators Perceive the Students' Roles in University Policy and Decision Making." Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1968.

10. Evans, Richard I., et al. The University Faculty and Educational Television: Hostility, Resistance, & Change. USOE Grant No. 741015. Houston: University of Houston, 1962 and Evans, Richard I. Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

APPENDIX A

Interview Schedule

1. Do you think students should have a voice in determining -- all, any, or none -- of the following activities within this school (assume no legal aspects):

(TO THE INTERVIEWER -- after obtaining a "yes," "no," or "don't know" to each activity on the list, elaboration of each "yes" and "no" is to be sought. For each "no" a question to this effect: "Will you please elaborate your objections?" For each "yes" a question to this effect: "I'd like to get your views on some of the necessary details. For example, should all students at all levels (freshman-senior) participate? Should students have full voting rights? How should the students be chosen?)

a. Student discipline — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
b. Evaluation of teachers — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
c. Academic calendar arrangements — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
d. Curriculum planning — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
e. Degree requirements — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
f. Grading systems — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
g. Faculty governing board — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
h. Legal governing board — Yes ____, No ____, Don't Know ____
i. Are there any other aspects of student participation which you would like to mention?

2. What characteristics or qualities of undergraduate students today irritate you?

(TO THE INTERVIEWER -- Do not probe - write down only those mentioned spontaneously and then for each one mentioned ask: This _____ irritates you to what degree?)

a. _____ Mild ____, Mod. ____, Strong ____
b. _____ Mild ____, Mod. ____, Strong ____
c. _____ Mild ____, Mod. ____, Strong ____

3. What positive characteristics or qualities do you notice in today's undergraduates? (AGAIN - DO NOT PROBE)

a. _____ Mild ____, Mod. ____, Strong ____
b. _____ Mild ____, Mod. ____, Strong ____
c. _____ Mild ____, Mod. ____, Strong ____

---

*Modified to save space -- the original contains ample space between items for notes, etc.

4. If you alone could introduce one major change on this campus which would result in an improved learning situation for undergraduate students, what would it be?

(TO THE INTERVIEWER -- If the suggestion is a general one, attempt to get a very specific suggestion. IF NO SUGGESTIONS ARE OFFERED after a few minutes thought, record "none." DO NOT PROBE.)

APPENDIX B

TABLE I

PERCENTAGES OF "YES," "NO," AND "DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES AT NEARBY COLLEGES

Question No. 1

Activity		Carson Newman College N=21	Knoxville College N=10	Maryville College N=16	George Peabody College N=17	Tenn. Tech. Univ. N=35
Student Discipline	Yes	90	90	100	94	88
	No	10	10	0	0	12
	Don't Know	0	0	0	6	0
Evaluation of Teachers	Yes	81	80	93	82	91
	No	19	20	7	6	9
	Don't Know	0	0	0	12	0
Academic Calendar	Yes	57	60	56	65	60
	No	38	30	44	18	34
	Don't Know	5	10	0	17	6
Curriculum Planning	Yes	24	80	81	71	49
	No	76	20	19	23	46
	Don't Know	0	0	0	6	5
Degree Requirements	Yes	24	30	44	47	43
	No	71	70	50	41	45
	Don't Know	5	0	6	12	12
Grading Systems	Yes	24	50	68	59	57
	No	76	50	19	29	34
	Don't Know	0	0	13	12	9
Faculty Governing Board	Yes	52	20	44	59	66
	No	38	80	44	29	29
	Don't Know	10	0	12	12	5
Legal Governing Board	Yes	24	20	25	35	20
	No	66	70	63	30	66
	Don't Know	10	10	12	35	14

APPENDIX C

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF "YES," "NO," AND "DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Question No. 1

Activity		Agr. N=14	B.A. N=10	Edu. N=9	Engg. N=13	Home Ec. N=5	L.A. N=29
Student Discipline	Yes	100	80	88	85	80	86
	No	0	20	12	15	0	10
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	20	4
Evaluation of Teachers	Yes	100	90	55	69	80	86
	No	0	10	45	31	20	10
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	4
Academic Calendar	Yes	71	70	77	15	100	55
	No	22	30	23	85	0	35
	Don't Know	7	0	0	0	0	10
Curriculum Planning	Yes	71	30	55	8	60	45
	No	29	70	45	92	40	51
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	4
Degree Requirements	Yes	64	20	44	0	20	21
	No	36	80	56	100	60	75
	Don't Know	0	0	0	0	20	4
Grading Systems	Yes	86	50	55	23	40	55
	No	14	50	33	69	60	38
	Don't Know	0	0	12	8	0	7
U.T. Senate	Yes	79	10	33	62	40	59
	No	14	80	67	38	20	34
	Don't Know	7	10	0	0	40	7
Board of Trustees	Yes	50	10	0	0	20	24
	No	50	90	88	100	80	66
	Don't Know	0	0	12	0	0	10

APPENDIX D

Scoring System and Results for Questions Two and Three

Faculties

Weights were assigned as follows to the replies of each faculty member: Strong = 4; Moderate = 3; Mild = 2; None = 1. In this manner, two scores -- one for Question Two and one for Question Three -- were obtained for each respondent. The highest score was interpreted to mean how that individual felt predominantly about students.

The table below indicates the number of faculty members by groups who scored highest in each of the categories.

TABLE VI

FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS
Questions Two and Three

						University of Tennessee					
	CN	KC	MC	GPC	TTU	Ag	BA	Ed	Engg	HE	LA
Positive	5	4	2	8	16	7	3	7	6	5	6
Irritating	7	4	9	5	9	5	3	2	4	0	15
Equal	9	2	5	4	10	2	4	0	3	0	8

Administrators

The table below indicates similar data for the administrators.

TABLE VII

ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS
Questions Two and Three

	UT	CN	KC	MC	TTU	TOTAL
Positive	4	1	2	1	1	9
Irritating	2	1	0	0	1	4
Equal	4	1	0	2	1	8

APPENDIX E

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE OF "YES," "NO," AND "DON'T KNOW" RESPONSES BY ADMINISTRATORS

Question No. 1

Activity		University of Tennessee N=10	Others N=11
Student Discipline	Yes	100	100
	No	0	0
	Don't Know	0	0
Evaluation of Teachers	Yes	91	100
	No	9	0
	Don't Know	0	0
Academic Calendar	Yes	91	80
	No	9	10
	Don't Know	0	10
Curriculum Planning	Yes	73	70
	No	18	10
	Don't Know	9	20
Degree Requirements	Yes	27	80
	No	73	20
	Don't Know	0	0
Grading Systems	Yes	73	80
	No	18	20
	Don't Know	9	0
Faculty Governing Board	Yes	45.5	100
	No	45.5	0
	Don't Know	9	0
Legal Governing Board	Yes	45.5	30
	No	45.5	70
	Don't Know	9	0

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

(TOP)

ERIC ACCESSION NO.	CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER	RESUME DATE	P.A.	T.A.
		05-10-68		

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

001

100 TITLE
101 SURVEY
102 OF FACULTY VIEWS ON STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING
103 FINAL REPORT

200 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Milton, Ohmer

300 INSTITUTION (SOURCE) The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee
Learning Resources Center — SOURCE CODE

310 REPORT/SERIES NO.

320 OTHER SOURCE — SOURCE CODE

330 OTHER REPORT NO.

340 OTHER SOURCE — SOURCE CODE

350 OTHER REPORT NO.

400 PUB'L. DATE 05 - 10 -68 | CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER OEG-1-7-070037-4347

500 PAGINATION, ETC.
501 31

600 RETRIEVAL TERMS
601 Survey
602 Higher Education
603 Faculty Opinions
604 Student Involvement
605 Decision Making
606

607 IDENTIFIERS
Tennessee Colleges

800 ABSTRACT
The major purpose of this investigation was to explore faculty attitudes about student involvement in determining cogent campus policies in a somewhat detailed and systematic fashion. The effort was made also to obtain data which might reflect the conventionality of faculty thinking about approaches to teaching-learning. A randomly selected sample of full-time faculty members was interviewed at each of the following schools: Carson-Newman College, Knoxville College, Maryville College, George Peabody College for Teachers, Tennessee Technological University, and The University of Tennessee (Knoxville campus). Each respondent could respond "Yes," "No," or "Don't Know" about student participation in specific areas (for example, Curriculum Planning) and also qualify his answers. There is agreement among faculties that students should participate rather fully in matters of student discipline, that they should not participate in the affairs of a legal governing board, and that they should participate in the evaluation of teachers. This latter means that students should complete evaluative types of questionnaires and that results should be seen only by the teacher concerned. A "Yes" vote in other areas means only that student ideas should be received; thinking is not clear about the means by which student views should be obtained. This study has been highly limited in its sampling of institutions of higher education. More land grant colleges and universities should be sampled via mailed questionnaires.

OE 6000 (Rev. 9-66)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING ERIC REPORT RESUME

The resume is used to identify summary data and information about each document acquired, processed, and stored within the ERIC system. In addition to serving as a permanent record of the document in the collection, the resume is also a means of dissemination. All fields of the form must be completed in the allotted spaces, but inapplicable fields should be left blank. The following instructions are keyed to the line numbers appearing in the left margin of the form:

TOP LINE. ERIC Accession No. Leave blank. A permanent ED number will be assigned to each resume and its corresponding document as they are processed into the ERIC system.

LINE 001. Clearinghouse Accession No. For use only by ERIC Clearinghouses. Enter the alpha code and 6-digit document number.

Resume Date. In numeric form, enter month, day, and year that resume is completed. *(Example: 07 14 66)*

P.A. Leave blank.

T.A. Leave blank.

Copyright. Check appropriate block to denote presence of copyrighted material within the document.

ERIC Reproduction Release. Check appropriate block to indicate that ERIC has permission to reproduce the document and its resume form.

LINES 100–103. Title. Enter the complete document title, including subtitles if they add significant information. Where applicable, also enter volume number or part number, and the type of document *(Final Report, Interim Report, Thesis, etc.)*.

LINE 200. Personal Author(s). Enter personal author(s), last name first. *(Example: Doe, John J.)* If two authors are given, enter both. *(Example: Doe, John J. Smith, Ted).* If there are three or more authors, list only one followed by "and others."

LINE 300. Institution *(Source)*. Enter the name of the organization which originated the report. Include the address *(city and State)* and the subordinate unit of the organization. *(Example: Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass., School of Education.)*

Source Code. Leave blank.

LINE 310. Report/Series No. Enter any unique number assigned to the document by the institutional source. *(Example: SC-1234)*

LINE 320. Other Source. Use only when a second source is associated with the document. Follow instructions for Line 300 above.

Source Code. Leave blank.

LINE 330. Other Report No. Enter document number assigned by the second source.

LINE 340. Other Source. Use only when a third source is associated with the document. Follow instructions for Line 300 above.

Source Code. Leave blank.

LINE 350. Other Report No. Enter document number assigned by the third source.

LINE 400. Publication Date. Enter the day, month, and year of the document. *(Example: 12 Jun 66)*

Contract/Grant Number. Applicable only for documents generated from research sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. Enter appropriate contract or grant number and its prefix. *(Example: OEC-1-6-061234-0033)*

LINES 500–501. Pagination, etc. Enter the total number of pages of the document, including illustrations and appendixes. *(Example: 115p.)* USE THIS SPACE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTINENT TO THE DOCUMENT, such as publisher, journal citation, and other contract numbers.

LINES 600–606. Retrieval Terms. Enter the important subject terms *(descriptors)* which, taken as a group, adequately describe the contents of the document.

LINE 607. Identifiers. Enter any additional important terms, more specific than descriptors, such as trade names, equipment model names and numbers, organization and project names, discussed in the document.

LINES 800–822. Abstract. Enter an informative abstract of the document. Its style and content must be suitable for public announcement and dissemination.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O—231-331